

REMARKS

This application was originally filed on 21 December 2001 with nineteen claims, two of which were written in independent form. Claims 10-19 have been canceled without prejudice. No claims have been allowed.

The disclosure was objected to for typographical error. The applicant has amended the specification to correct the typographical error.

Claims 5, 6, and 8 were objected to for failing to provide sufficient antecedent basis for “metallization layer” and “visible corner.” Claims 5, 6, and 8 have been amended to overcome this objection.

Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 6 has been amended to overcome this rejection.

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,153,379 Guzuk *et al.* (“Guzuk”).

Claim 1 has been amended to recite, “an upper portion of said package on said top surface of said lower portion, a portion of said lower portion and a corresponding portion of said intermediate metalization layer extending beyond said upper portion such that one of said corners is unique relative to other said corners.” The applicant respectfully submits the corners of Guzuk all appear to be beveled such that none of the corners is unique relative to the other corners.

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,037,698 to Ueda *et al.* (“Ueda”).

Claim 1 has been amended to recite, “a portion of said lower portion and a corresponding portion of said intermediate metalization layer extending beyond said upper portion such that one of said corners is unique relative to other said corners.” The applicant respectfully submits that Ueda, does not appear to show, teach, or suggest this limitation. Figures 4, 11, 13, 15, 16, 18, 20, and 21 of Ueda illustrates a notch, 22a, 22b, 22c, and 22d, in each corner of the lower portion 5.

Claims 3-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Guzuk. Claim

2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Ueda. Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Guzik.

Claims 2-9 depend from Claim 1 and should be deemed allowable for that reason and on their own merits. For the reasons given above with respect to Claim 1, the prior art does not appear to show, teach, or suggest the limitations of Claim 1, much less the limitations of Claim 1 in combination with the additional limitations of the dependent claims.

Claims 20-28 have been added by this amendment. Claims 20-28 are similar to Claims 1-9 and should be deemed allowable for similar reasons.

In view of the amendments and the remarks presented herewith, it is believed that the claims currently in the application accord with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112 and are allowable over the prior art of record. Therefore, it is urged that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Charles A. Brill/
Charles A. Brill
Reg. No. 37,786

Texas Instruments Incorporated
PO Box 655474 M/S 3999
Dallas, TX 75265
(972) 917-4379
FAX: (972) 917-4418